ADDITIONAL FEE:

Please charge any insufficiency of fee, or credit any excess, to Deposit Account No. 50-0427.

R E M A R K S

The Office Action issued May 17, 2005 has been received and its contents have been carefully considered.

Claim 3 has been amended to restore the word "window" in the final, whereby clause. This word was inadvertently changed to "cut" in applicant's prior Amendment.

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(b) as being anticipated by Shiota et al., U.S. Publication No. 2002/01154079.

Claims 1-3, and 5-6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shiota et al. and further in view of Murakami et al., U.S. Publication No. 2003/0025846.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections set forth above. For a 102(b) rejection, the prior art must teach all aspect of the current invention. Shiota et al. does not teach "a method of changing a bright pixel to a dark pixel", as occurs with the present

invention. Instead, Shiota et al. teach a repair method wherein bad pixels are recovered and made functional.

Shiota et al. is directed to liquid crystal TVs with low resolution display. The pixel size in liquid crystal TVs are larger than that of other displays and pixel defects are more easily visible. Shiota et al. teach a method to recover bad pixels so that they are fully functional thereby improving overall manufacturing yield. (Shiota et al. para. 0102).

Shiota et al. therefore teach away from the present invention. The present invention concerns a configuration and method to change a defective pixel that is a continually bright pixel into a defective pixel that is a continually dark pixel. Since Shiota et al. teach away from the current invention it is improper to combine references for a 103(a) rejection. In addition, there would be no motivation for a person skilled in the art to combine the teaching of Shiota et al. with that of Murakami et al. because Shiota et al. is directed at repairing defective pixels while Murakami et al. is directed at the further destruction of pixels.

The configuration disclosed and claimed herein provides access to the pixel electrode in a target area where the

pixel electrode can be severed by a single cut. Cut failure is reduced because only the pixel electrode is cut. "Unlike in the conventional method in which aluminum members are short-circuited, the pixel electrode 16 [made of conductive thin film such as indium tin oxide] can be cut by a lower-energy laser beam." (Specification, sentence bridging pages 6-7). By reducing the laser energy, other complications such as meltdown of the aluminum members, heat transfer to the liquid crystal, and generation of bubbles in and around the aperature are eliminated. (Specification, pages 2, 3 and 8).

In conclusion, therefore, claims 1-6 are believed to distinguish patentably over prior art.

Accordingly, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance. A formal Notice of Allowance is accordingly respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Karl F. Milde, Jr.
Reg. No. 24,822

MILDE & HOFFBERG, LLP
10 Bank Street - Suite 460
White Plains, NY 10606

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Services as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231 on 7-29-05

By _____
Date 7-29-05